

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 16-29 are pending. Claims 7-9 and 16-26 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 5, 27-29 are independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0136962 (Miyajima et al.).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended.

Independent claim 1 now recites a device comprising: a semiconductor substrate; a pixel cell array integrated with the semiconductor substrate; a liquid crystal layer in contact with the pixel cell array; a substantially transparent protective cover coupled to the liquid crystal layer; a base coupled to the semiconductor substrate, wherein thermal expansion characteristics of the base are substantially similar to thermal expansion characteristics of the protective cover, and a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the base.

Miyajima et al. do not teach or suggest the device of claim 1.

Miyajima et al. disclose an LCD having a first substrate 100 and a second substrate 500 made of transparent insulating material such as glass, and a liquid crystal 200 placed between the two substrates (para 0031).

However, even if the substrate 100 constitutes a base, as asserted in the Office Action, Miyajima et al. do not teach or suggest a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the asserted base.

For at least the reasons above, Miyajima et al. do not teach or suggest a device comprising: a semiconductor substrate; a pixel cell array integrated with the semiconductor substrate; a liquid crystal layer in contact with the pixel cell array; a substantially transparent protective cover coupled to the liquid crystal layer; a base coupled to the semiconductor substrate, wherein thermal expansion characteristics of the base are substantially similar to thermal expansion characteristics of the protective cover, and a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the base, as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 1 should therefore be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejects claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyajima et al. in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,081,305 (Sato et al.).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 27

Independent claim 27 has been amended.

Independent claim 27 now recites a system comprising: an Ultra High Pressure light source to emit light; a condenser lens to condense the light; a display device to receive the condensed light and to emit image light, the display device comprising: a semiconductor substrate; a pixel cell array integrated with the semiconductor substrate; a liquid crystal layer in contact with the pixel cell array; a substantially transparent protective cover coupled to the liquid crystal layer; a base coupled to the semiconductor substrate, thermal expansion characteristics of the base being substantially similar to thermal expansion characteristics of the protective cover;

and a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the base; and a projector lens to project the image light.

Neither Miyajima et al., nor Sato et al., nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action, teaches or suggests the system of claim 27.

As stated above, Miyajima et al. disclose an LCD having a first substrate 100 and a second substrate 500 made of transparent insulating material such as glass, and a liquid crystal 200 placed between the two substrates (para 0031).

However, even if the substrate 100 constitutes a base, as asserted in the Office Action, Miyajima et al. do not teach or suggest a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the asserted base.

Sato et al disclose a liquid crystal light valve constructed by a semiconductor substrate 100 on which a pixel circuit and a drive circuit are formed. In an installation of the liquid crystal light valve, the semiconductor substrate 100 is bonded to a ceramic substrate 500 (col. 16, lines 59-63). A signal terminal 550 of the facing substrate 300 is connected to a wiring pattern formed on the ceramic substrate by a wire bonding 520 (col. 17, lines 4-8).

However, even if the ceramic substrate 500 constitutes a base, as asserted in the previous Office Action, Sato et al. do not teach or suggest a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the asserted base.

For at least the reasons above, neither Miyajima et al., nor Sato et al., nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action, teaches or suggests a system comprising: an Ultra High Pressure light source to emit light; a condenser lens to condense the light; a display device to receive the condensed light and to emit image light, the display device comprising: a semiconductor substrate; a pixel cell array integrated with the semiconductor substrate; a liquid crystal layer in contact with the pixel cell array; a substantially transparent protective cover coupled to the liquid crystal layer; a base coupled to the semiconductor substrate, thermal expansion characteristics of the base being substantially similar to thermal expansion characteristics of the protective cover; and a chip carrier having an upper surface coupled to a lower surface of the base; and a projector lens to project the image light, as recited in claim 27.

Independent claim 27 should therefore be allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 28-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 5 and 28-29 have been amended to put these claims in independent form.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 5 and 28-29 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 6 and 10 depend from independent claim 5 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 5.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Because the reasons set forth above are sufficient to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants do not address some of the assertions set forth therein and/or other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections. Nonetheless, Applicants reserve the right to address such assertions and/or to present other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections in any future paper and/or proceeding.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0006, ext. 1014.

Respectfully submitted,

September 14, 2007
Date

/Mark Steinberg/
Mark Steinberg
Registration No. 40,829
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0006, ext. 1014